

# FARMINGTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, October 14, 2004

---

## PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION

**Present:** Chairman Cory Ritz, Commission Members Keith Klundt, Bart Hill, John Montgomery, Kevin Poff, Cindy Roybal, and Jim Talbot, City Planner David Petersen, and Deputy City Recorder Jeane Chipman.

**Chairman Ritz** called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. and offered the invocation.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**Cindy Roybal** moved that the Planning Commission approve the minutes of the September 23, 2004, Planning Commission Meeting. **Kevin Poff** seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously in favor. Chairman Ritz abstained due to his absence during the September 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting.

### PUBLIC HEARING: GARY AND KENT GINES REQUEST FOR PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL FOR A PROPOSED 6 LOT SUBDIVISION LOCATED ON THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF 475 SOUTH AND 1100 WEST IN AN AE ZONE (S-13-04) (Agenda Item #2)

#### Background Information

The City Council, after receiving a recommendation from the Planning Commission, approved the schematic plan for the Gines Subdivision on August 4, 2004. One issue was left unresolved regarding the rear or northern lot line of the 4 lots fronting 475 South Street. Some members of the City Council wanted these 4 lots to be as large as possible (or the rear lot line moved 15 feet to the north). Another member of the Council and the applicant suggested it was more important for the neighborhood that lots 5 and 6 be as large as possible. Therefore, the City Council approved the schematic plan, but it was recommended that the Planning Commission resolve the lot size issue after receiving public input at preliminary plat review.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

**Mr. Petersen** explained the discussion held by the City Council regarding where to place the property line. The City Council asked that the Planning Commission hold a public hearing and decide the issue. Staff recommended approval of the request.

#### Public Hearing

**Chairman Ritz** opened the meeting to a public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

**Gary Gines** had studied the situation with surrounding lots and stated it would not make a significant difference where the lot line was placed. He would be satisfied with whatever the Planning Commission decided.

**Charlene Tschaggeny** (west Farmington property owner) stated she was in favor of the design as presented.

### **Public Hearing Closed**

With no further comments, **Chairman Ritz** closed the public hearing. The Commission members discussed the issues, including the following points:

- The developer was not in opposition to squaring off the lot to make Lot 6 a square lot.
- Lots 5 and 6 would benefit from gaining the extra footage in order to give them the maximum opportunity to be large animal lots.
- Lots 1 through 4 are smaller but are closest to the smaller lots in surrounding neighborhoods.

### **Motion**

**Bart Hill** moved that the Planning Commission approve preliminary plat as requested subject to all applicable development standards and Farmington City ordinances and the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall comply with all conditions of schematic plan approval as set forth in the August 4, 2004, City Council minutes and the July 13, 21004, Planning Commission minutes.
2. The north to south lot line distance of the 4 lots abutting 475 South Street shall be left as shown on the preliminary plat.
3. The applicant shall prepare and submit a soils report to Farmington City as required by the Subdivision Ordinance.

**Jim Talbot** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

### **Findings**

- The motion preserves the larger lots adjacent to 1100 West where people have the greatest concerns regarding open space and large animal lots.
- The motion conforms to zoning ordinances.
- The conservancy lot precludes developers from further subdividing.

**GARY GINES REQUEST FOR A RECOMMENDATION FOR FINAL PLAT APPROVAL FOR A PROPOSED 4 LOT SUBDIVISION LOCATED ON THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF 475 SOUTH AND 1100 WEST IN AN AE ZONE (S-13-04) (Agenda Item #3)**

**Mr. Petersen** showed the Planning Commission the final plat design.

**Motion**

After a brief discussion, **Jim Talbot** moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the final plat as requested subject to all applicable development standards and Farmington City Ordinances and the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall comply with all conditions of preliminary plat approval.
2. The final plat shall not be recorded until all improvement drawings related thereto are reviewed and approved by the City Engineer, Public Works Department, Fire Department, Central Davis County Sewer District, and Weber Basin Water Conservancy District.
3. A note shall be placed on the final plat indicating a soils report has been prepared and submitted to Farmington City in accordance with the Farmington City Subdivision Ordinance.
4. A note shall be placed on the final plat, which note shall be acceptable to the City, indicating that the future owners of the platted lots are purchasing property in an a rural area, and noise and odors associated with adjacent or nearby agriculture uses are customarily appropriate in these areas.

**Cindy Roybal** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**Findings**

- The motion preserves the larger lots adjacent to 1100 West where people have the

greatest concerns regarding open space and large animal lots.

- The motion conforms to zoning ordinances.
- The conservancy lot precludes developers from further subdividing.

**PUBLIC HEARING: GEORGE HADDAD REQUEST FOR A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR SCHEMATIC PLAN APPROVAL FOR THE MOUNTAINSIDE PLAT F SUBDIVISION CONSISTING OF 19 LOTS ON 7.523 ACRES LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 775 SOUTH 350 EAST IN AN LR-F ZONE (S-1-03) (Agenda Item #4)**

**Mr. Petersen** discussed the location of the property involved on Agenda Item #4. The street was already improved because developments to the east had to have access. Mr. Haddad wanted to have a preliminary plat approval at the time the street was improved so that he could accurately place sewer laterals. Due to market fluctuations and other factors, Mr. Haddad allowed his previous approvals to lapse. At this point the developer is ready to go forward and was asking for a renewal of his approval.

**Public Hearing**

**Chairman Ritz** opened the meeting to a public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

**Larry Boring** (attorney for George Haddad) wanted to clarify that it was really the developers of the other subdivision that allowed the prior approvals to lapse. Mr. Haddad was very interested in having approval so he could move forward with the development of his property.

**Public Hearing Closed**

With no further comments, **Chairman Ritz** closed the public hearing.

**Motion**

**John Montgomery** moved that the Planning Commission recommend the City Council grant schematic plan approval in accordance with previous approvals. **Kevin Poff** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**Findings**

The applicant had received a recommendation for schematic plan approval twice before, once on January 23, 2003, and another on May 25, 2000. Both approvals have expired. This time the applicant was ready to move forward and has submitted improvement drawings for the storm drain which have been reviewed and approved by the City Engineer. Improvement drawings are usually reviewed concurrently with the review of the final plat, however, the City is bound by its own ordinances to review a schematic plan prior to consideration of a preliminary plat and final plat.

**FARMINGTON CITY REQUEST FOR A RECOMMENDATION REGARDING A ONE LOT PLAT AMENDMENT TO THE OAKRIDGE PARK ESTATES PHASE II PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1190 WEST OAKRIDGE PARK DRIVE IN AN LR (PUD) ZONE (S-5-03) (Agenda Item #5)**

**Background Information**

The Planning Commission recently reviewed a similar proposal on August 26, 2004, for minor plat approval for a one lot subdivision known as Oakridge Park Estates Phase III. The Planning Commission recommended that the City Council deny the request (September 13, 2004). Notwithstanding this, the City Council still desires to create a one lot subdivision, but instead of a stand alone phase of the Oakridge Park PUD as requested previously, they are proposing to amend the second phase of the Oakridge PUD to include an additional lot. Thereby ensuring that the new lot must meet all of the covenants, conditions, and restrictions of the existing subdivision. In order for the City Council to consider an amendment to an existing subdivision plat, a public hearing must be held on the matter within 45 days after receipt of a recommendation from the Planning Commission regarding the proposed amendment or alternation. Therefore, the City Council is requesting another recommendation from the Planning Commission regarding the new proposal to amend the subdivision plat.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

**Mr. Petersen** reviewed the background information.

**Cindy Roybal** stated that she had concerns about the sale of the property and the impact on the neighborhood near the park. After talking to residents and observing the use of the park, she had noted there were problems with parking, especially when groups would hold football practice on the park lawns. She also stated that the Weeks (adjacent property owners to the lot in question) had paid a premium to the home owners' association for what they considered a view lot. That view will not be obstructed by another home. Ms. Roybal felt it would be a matter of fairness for the HOA to exact that same amount from the new lot property owner and reimburse the Weeks family.

**Mr. Montgomery** expressed the fact that it did not seem there was an urgency for the City to sell the property. Why take the action at this point?

**Mr. Petersen** explained that the proposed lot could not be maintained without cost. The City Council did not want to lose funds because of the land, nor did they want the property to be a weed patch. The proceeds from the sale would go into the general fund. The action was precipitated by the inquiries of a potential buyer.

**Mr. Montgomery** suggested that the HOA pay to have the property made into parking and then maintain it.

**Mr. Petersen** stated that it may not be a significant improvement in the amount of parking spaces to convert the lot into asphalt.

**Mr. Talbot** noticed the two letters in the packet which indicated nearby owners would like to restrict who the builder was for the new home on the proposed lot. He felt the HOA could not restrict builders. The new home would, of course, have to comply with the CC&Rs of the subdivision.

**Ms. Roybal** stated that those participating in the football program in the community were not happy with the east/west configuration of the South Park. She stated the City should not spend funds improving that park because it was not really usable.

### **Motion**

**John Montgomery** moved that the Planning Commission recommend the City Council approve the plat amendment regarding the Oakridge Park Estates Phase II, Planned Unit Development located at approximately 1190 West Oakridge Park Drive. **Bart Hill** seconded the motion, which passed by 6 to 1 vote. **Ms. Roybal** opposed the motion because she felt there were issues not being addressed such as the parking problems and reimbursement for the adjacent neighbors.

### **Findings**

- The property was a remnant piece with no other viable options for development.
- Selling the property for single family residential use would improve the neighborhood rather than having the land as a weed patch.
- Proceeds from the sale would increase the general park fund.

- The property will be for sale as a lot within Phase II of the Oakridge Park Estates P.U.D. Doing so will ensure that the property is bound by the subdivision's CC&Rs and that it will comply with standards of the surrounding neighborhood.

**PUBLIC HEARING: GREG BELL REQUEST FOR A RECOMMENDATION TO REZONE 12.16 ACRES LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 400 WEST AND 675 NORTH FROM BP TO CMU (Z-12-04) (Agenda Item #6)**

**Background Information**

A concept development plan of the subject property was presented to the Planning Commission as a miscellaneous item on September 23, 2004. Several weeks ago, the Planning Commission established a sub-committee to prepare text for a commercial mixed use zone consistent with the recently adopted General Plan (see Agenda Item #10). The developer is requesting that the City rezone the subject property to CMU concurrently with adopting the CMU zone chapter of the Zoning Ordinance.

The developer is proposing two uses which, thus far, have not been contemplated by the subcommittee as uses allowed in the CMU zone. These uses include an "automobile and truck repair" and "fast food establishments, detached (may include vehicle drive through facilities)." The Planning Commission must decide, among other things, whether or not to include these uses as part of the new CMU zone.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

**Mr. Petersen** explained the agenda item. The Planning Commission was not legally able to act on the request until the CMU was officially approved. Mr. Petersen felt, however, that it may be helpful to have a sample request before them as the Planning Commission considered the CMU zone. Mr. Petersen briefly explained the CMU zone.

**Public Hearing**

**Chairman Ritz** opened the meeting to a public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

**Greg Bell** said that the property in question was a very important parcel. The land will be the terminus of U.S. 89, I-15 and Legacy. It will connect two important parts of the City. It will be an important gateway to the City. There had been several proposals for the property in the past that did not come to fruition. It was currently zoned Business Park (BP) and had been for sale for 5 or 6 years. The asking price was not within reasonable limits that would allow profitable office development. It is a commercial site. Within a week or two Mr. Bell stated he would own the

property and would like to have it zoned CMU. The road going north, when improved, would open up all the large property to the north of Lagoon Drive. There is a no access line with UDOT along Burke Lane and none with 150 feet of the intersection to development. He proposed that a fast food facility, a gas station, storage units, and Larry Haugen's auto repair shop be developed on the property. He said that the design would be an attractive development. Lagoon was very concerned about residential neighbors. Mr. Bell had met with them regarding the proposed use of the land, and Lagoon officials indicated they were comfortable with the proposal.

**Mr. Petersen** reviewed the text of the CMU zone being considered. The storage rental, the auto repair, and the fast food facility were not a permitted under the ordinance. However, the committee working on the zone text suggested adding the storage rental and fast food facility under conditional uses.

**Mr. Montgomery** asked why the property was not being left commercial rather than dealing with the CMU zone in light of the proposed uses. Commercial zoning would allow all the suggested uses, where the CMU would have to be adjusted in order to allow even some of the proposed uses.

**Mr. Petersen** said that the committee was willing to have the fast food and the storage unit come in if design standards were very strict.

**Mr. Talbot** stated he liked the CMU because of the control and quality of the designs standards, especially in an area that would be a gateway to the City.

**Daniel Nixon** wanted to do an upgraded storage facility. It would be the fifth one he had built in the Weber/Davis market. He stated he liked to cater to upscale communities. The landscaping would be integrated with the wetlands in the area and would tie in with the rest of the facilities on the property.

**Max Forbush** wanted to give the Commission members a little bit of background. The present City Council members were interested in trying to move the Haugen Body Shop to a new location. The reason was that they would like to protect the water well supply of the City. The present location of the Haugen Body Shop is near the best culinary water well in Farmington. Protecting this source was also a part of a State mandate regarding well head protection. The well had been there for 3 decades and was the City's best well. The City also wanted to create an RDA to help clean up the blight in that area. Mr. Forbush wanted it clear that Larry Haugen was a member of the City Council and would not vote when this item comes before the City Council. The motivation of the action by the City was to protect the well water and to make the use of the land more in harmony with surrounding property.

**Larry Haugen** stated his family had been at odds with the City over this property for



many years. This was an opportunity for both his family and the City to clean up the blighted area. In moving to the new area he felt he could improve the looks of the shop and use landscaping and other resources to have an attractive facility. Mr. Haugen had no reason to clean up the current property. The body shop, car sales, tow service would all be a part of the new facility, but it would all be in a large building. Nothing would be seen from the street. He would like to see the current property developed into a nice residential area for the City. Mr. Haugen also stated there had been other offers for the property, but he was aware the other interested developers would want to get as high a density from the property as possible.

### **Public Hearing Closed**

With no further comments, **Chairman Ritz** closed the public hearing. The Commission members discussed the issues, including the following points:

- The Planning Commission and City Planner discussed the possibility of having the issue be resubmitted under the General Commercial Zone (C) rather than amending the work done on the current CMU proposal.
- In any case, the current property was zoned BP, thus the reason for the rezone request.
- Some of the proposed uses had been contemplated by the committee regarding whether or not they would be detrimental to the U.S. 89 corridor. Consultants recommended that certain commercial uses needed to be concentrated. However, the uses under consideration were not of that nature.
- If the request were to come to the Planning Commission as a rezone to “C”, the General Plan would have to be amended.
- The Planning Commission was hesitant about setting a precedence by proposing amendments to the CMU which would be contrary to all the efforts of the committee.
- The CMU could help upgrade the design of any development.
- The area under consideration was one of the major gateways to the City.
- Mr. Bell stated he was not really worried about the standards, etc., because he knew the development needed to be attractive and developed according to high standards. He was willing to work with the City because he knew that the land was very sensitive and uses were critical.

- Ms. Roybal reported that a current gas station owner in the City was very concerned about the competition of a new station on the proposed property. She also mentioned the concern that the Commission had regarding the gateway approach to the City. Ms. Roybal was very hesitant about having an auto repair shop at that gateway site.
- Commission members were aware the CMU would have to be addressed before the current request could be considered. However, they did feel it was a benefit to having a specific request come before them as a test of the new zone. There may be other uses that would fit in the zone that had not been thought about. If such uses makes sense, then the zone could be amended to accommodate the new uses.
- Commission members felt there should be great care taken when amending any zone solely to accommodate a single request.
- There were some Commission members who had concerns about the repair shop on the site. They felt such a use did not fit with the CMU intent.

### **Motion**

**John Montgomery** moved that the Planning Commission table consideration of the request to recommend the City Council rezone property located at 400 West 675 North from BP to CMU until a recommendation regarding the CMU zone is approved by the Planning Commission. **Keith Klundt** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**Mr. Petersen** stated the CMU committee was very close to being finished with their work. He asked if the Planning Commission would entertain consideration of the CMU and the Bell request on the same agenda. By consensus, the Commission stated they would not be opposed to have that happen.

**PUBLIC HEARING: R.K.BUIE CO., COWBOY PARTNERS, AND GARBETT HOMES  
REQUEST FOR A RECOMMENDATION FOR SCHEMATIC PLAN APPROVAL FOR  
A MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CONSISTING OF 159 FOR  
SALE RESIDENTIAL DWELLING UNITS ON 11.74 ACRES LOCATED AT  
APPROXIMATELY 850 NORTH SHEPARD CREEK PARKWAY IN A C ZONE (C-1--  
04) (Agenda Item #7)**

### **Background Information**

The applicant desires to move forward with the project, but because the residential

portion of the project consists of “for sale” units, a subdivision plat is required. The first step in the subdivision review process is schematic plan review, then preliminary plat, and final plat review. The site plan approval for this project should be considered concurrently with preliminary plat review. Therefore, the developer’s only requesting schematic plan approval at this time.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

**Mr. Petersen** introduced the agenda item by reviewing the background information.

### **Public Hearing**

**Chairman Ritz** opened the meeting to a public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

**Kent Buie** wanted to talk specifically about the proposed site plan for Farmington Crossing at Spring Creek Pond. The plan was to enhance and enlarge the pond and make an amenity out of the wetland. Mr. Buie described the four types of housing units being proposed for the development. He also explained the transportation corridors for the residential development.

**Page Walton** (Farmington Trails Committee) stated she was pleased to see the trail system being improved as part of the residential complex. She asked if the system would be constructed in phases or all at once.

**Mr. Buie** stated the trail system would be improved along with the adjacent development phase. He believed the development would be constructed fairly quickly and the trail would be connected fairly soon.

**Mary Dean** (President of the of condo association) stated she liked what was being planned for the property. She did have some concerns which involved transportation routes and traffic. She asked when connection to the frontage road would be completed. She also asked if the developer had planned for visitor parking. Her condominium neighborhood experienced problems with parking on the road and congested streets.

### **Public Hearing Closed**

With no further comments, **Chairman Ritz** closed the public hearing. The Commission members discussed the issues, including the following points:

- **Mr. Petersen** stated he would talk to the traffic engineers about having the road

connected now instead of later.

- The proposed density of the development should be high enough to provide funding ample to maintain the streets.
- The developer reported there were 70 off-street parking stalls in the design, not counting parking or garages.
- Some Commission members stated the City needed to be aware it was a possibility the development may at some future point request the City take over maintenance of the streets. It may be that the streets should be built to City standards.
- The proposal for the pond was a very beneficial amenity.
- Drainage is a problem for the entire area, especially with the high ground water level and the impervious surface which will be constructed on site.
- Commission members commended the developer for cooperating with the community.

### **Motion**

**Cindy Roybal** moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council grant schematic plan approval subject to all applicable Farmington City development standards and ordinances and conditions of conditional use approval granted by the Planning Commission on July 20, 2004. **Bart Hill** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

### **Findings**

- The developer complied with requests by the Planning Commission and other City officials,
- The developer had met and cooperated with citizens of the community.
- The request was consistent with the conditional use permit.

**CLARK JENKINS/ CONSIDERATION OF A MODIFICATION OR REVOCATION OF A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT ISSUED FOR THE FARMINGTON STATION CONDOMINIUMS LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 153 EAST 200 SOUTH (C-2-96) (Agenda Item #8)**

**Mr. Petersen** stated the Commission had requested an update on the situation regarding the conditional use permit issued to the Farmington Station Condominiums and possible none compliance with City standards. Mr. Petersen reviewed each of the conditions previously set forth by the Commission, which items were completed and which were still pending. Commission members asked for another update on pending items at the next meeting.

**DENIS W. BUTLER REQUEST FOR AN EXTENSION TIME REGARDING  
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT #C-14-03 TO EXPAND A CHURCH PARKING LOT  
LOCATED AT 823 SOUTH 50 EAST IN AN A ZONE (Agenda Item #9)**

**Mr. Petersen** reviewed the extension being requested. Mr. Butler (architect for the project) informed Mr. Petersen that the developer had expected to bid the parking lot expansion in time to begin construction this fall. An agreement regarding the wetlands and plan approval from utility companies and the City were still pending. Because of those delays, Mr. Butler stated there would be no practical way to pave the parking lot prior to bad weather, thus the request for the extension. Mr. Petersen recommended that the Commission grant the request.

**Kevin Poff** moved that the Planning Commission grant an extension for the conditional use permit #C-14-03 to expand a church parking lot located at 825 South 50 East in an A zone. **John Montgomery** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**PUBLIC HEARING: FARMINGTON CITY REQUEST FOR A RECOMMENDATION  
REGARDING TEXT FOR THE PROPOSED COMMERCIAL MIXED USE ZONE  
(CMU) (ZT-5-02) (Agenda Item #10)**

**Mr. Petersen** commented that most of the issues had already been covered in Agenda Item #6. The Planning Commission briefly discussed the issue, including the following points:

- There was grave concern regarding the car repair shop at the gateway of the City.
- If the car repair facility was allowed in the CMU zone for the property in question, it would have to be allowed in all CMU zones throughout the City.
- A suggestion was made to divide the car repair shop and only allow light repair work on the proposed site, with heavy repairs done off-site in an industrial zone in the City.
- High standards on property at the gateway to the City needed to be enforced.

**Public Hearing**

**Chairman Ritz** opened the meeting to a public hearing.

**Public Hearing Closed**

With no forthcoming comments, **Chairman Ritz** closed the public hearing.

**Motion**

**John Montgomery** moved that the Planning Commission table consideration of the proposed Commercial Mixed Use Zone (CMU) (ZT-5-02) until the CMU committee finalized and resubmitted the document. **Jim Talbot** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**CLARK LANE/STATION PARK SOUTH ANNEXATION RECOMMENDATION (3.723 ACRES) (A-2-04) (Agenda Item #11)**

**Background Information**

Past annexations by Farmington City inadvertently resulted in the creation of remnant unincorporated parcels of ground which should be annexed. Farmington City is now pursuing this “house keeping” item because the City is entering into an agreement with the County to take over the ownership and maintenance of Clark Lane from 650 West to 1100 West Street in exchange for the County taking over the maintenance of various storm drain facilities including the Rudd Creek detention basin.

It has been a common practice in the past that if no development is pending that Farmington City usually zones the property “A” (Agriculture). It is recommended that the City zone the subject parcels “A.”

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

**Mr. Petersen** briefly explained the annexation recommendation. He stated City staff recommended approval and that the property be zoned Agriculture (A).

**Motion**

**Jim Talbot** moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the annexation of the Clark Lane/ Station Park property (3.723 acres) as requested and that the property be zoned Agriculture (A). **Bart Hill** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

### **Findings**

- The motion was an administrative housing keeping item to take care of business omitted in previous actions.
- The motion zoned the property in conformity with surrounding property.

### **ROSE COVE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT REVOCATION DISCUSSION (Agenda Item #12)**

**Mr. Petersen** said there was 2.5 acres north of the Rose Cove complex that were supposed to be landscaped by the developer as per previous development agreements. The City had sent notices to the developer and the weeds had been cut, however, all tenants of the development agreement had not been met. The City was in the process of meeting with the developer. If the developer does not comply, then the City Planner asked that the Commission consider revocation of the permit.

By consensus the Planning Commission supported the City Planner's actions

### **MISCELLANEOUS, CORRESPONDENCE, CITY COUNCIL REPORT (Agenda Item #13)**

Alysa Revell had recently been appointed the chairman of the Farmington Historic Preservation Commissions.

Mr. Petersen reminded Commission members about the Certified Citizen Planner Seminar to be held in November. If any member wishes to attend, they should contact the City Offices.

Mr. Petersen briefly reviewed information regarding the South Davis Transit Needs Analysis Policy. Information was contained in the packet.

The City Council covered the following items in their meeting on October 6, 2004:

- The Council continued consideration of the Transit Oriented Development Zone text until their next meeting on October 20<sup>th</sup>.
- The Neighborhood Mixed Use (NMU) zone was approved.
- The City Council granted final subdivision plat approval for the Deer Point

Subdivision located at approximately 1925 North Compton Road (Tom Morgan).

- The City Council authorized City Staff to move forward with initial improvements on Clark Lane and to move forward with design and eventual construction of the roundabout at 1075 West street.

Mr. Petersen also reported the recent Board of Adjustment meeting as follows:

- The Board of Adjustment granted a variance allowing Kris Hanson to keep 2 dwarf miniature horses at 528 South 350 East.
- The Board of Adjustment granted a variance to John White to exceed the City's driveway slope standards on property located at 1273 South 200 East.
- The Board of Adjustment tabled the request by Brad Knowlton for a variance to exceed the City's building height standards for a single family home at 478 East Island View Circle until more information could be attained from the Building Inspector.
- The Board upheld the decision of the Zoning Administrator and denied H.H.I. Corporation's request for approval to construct an accessory building within a non-conforming "contractor's yard" located at 49 North Main.

Mr. Petersen reported the status of the DMV request for a building on 200 West. The Planning Commission decision was appealed to the City Council. The hearing date was set for October 20, 2004.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**Cindy Roybal** moved that the Planning Commission adjourn at 10:05 P.M.

---

*Cory Ritz, Chairman*  
*Farmington City Planning Commission*